

AF  
IPL



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS' RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

APPLICANTS: Birkhoelzer et al. GROUP ART UNIT: 2152  
SERIAL NO.: 09/992,974 EXAMINER: Ramsey Refai  
FILED: November 19, 2001 CONFIRMATION NO.: 7671  
TITLE: "MEDICAL SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE WITH A  
WORKSTATION AND A CALL SYSTEM"

**MAIL STOP AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

S I R:

4/11/06  
DO NOT  
ENTER

Applicants herewith submit the present Response to the Final Rejection dated September 15, 2005. A Notice of Appeal was filed on February 14, 2006, but the Appeal Brief has not yet been filed.

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated September 15, 2005, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the term "medical examination images" was not used consistently throughout the claim. Applicants filed an Amendment on January 17, 2006 wherein (in Applicants' opinion) only editorial changes were made in the claims in order to respond to this rejection. In an Advisory Action dated February 1, 2006, the Examiner stated that those changes raised a new issue, and therefore Amendment "C" was not entered. Applicants thereafter filed a Petition on February 14, 2006 requesting entry of the Amendment, and this Petition was denied in another Advisory Action dated March 9, 2006.

The further arguments and exhibits discussed below were also presented in Amendment "C". The exhibits were presented because the Examiner at page 10 of